DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 324 531 CE 056 141

AUTHOR Miller, Marinell
TITLE Cooperation between Special Education and Vocational Rehabilitation: An Examination of Role Functions, Inservice Needs, Attitudes and Values.
INSTITUTION Missouri Univ., Columbia. Dept. of Practical Arts and Vocational-Technical Education.
SPONS AGENCY Missouri State Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Education, Jefferson City. Div. of Special Education.; Missouri State Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Education, Jefferson City. Div. of Vocational and Adult Education.
PUB DATE Jun 90
NOTE 51p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitudes; Cooperative Planning; *Cooperative Programs; Coordination; *Counselor Role; *Disabilities; Education Work Relationship; *Institutional Cooperation; Postsecondary Education; Rehabilitation Counseling; Supported Employment; *Vocational Adjustment; *Vocational Rehabilitation
IDENTIFIERS *Missouri

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationships between Vocational Adjustment Counselors (VACs) and Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors (VRCs) in Missouri and identified factors that are related to cooperative programming between special education and vocational rehabilitation. The population for the study consisted of all VACs (n=147), all state-federal VRCs assigned to cooperative education programs, and state-federal VRCs with other types of assignments in Missouri (n=145). Usable surveys were returned by 74% of this sample (VRC-83%, VAC-64%). Some of the findings of the study were the following: (1) VACs are spending more time teaching and less time supervising students on work sites, or developing work stations; (2) VRCs also were spending less time on job development or supervision; (3) clarification is needed regarding responsibilities and roles of VACs and VRCs in supported employment and job placement; (4) perceptions of the groups toward the other was more negative if they had not worked together in special education; and (5) the groups shared more similarities than differences in values, but VRCs valued economic returns more than did VACs, VACs valued responsibility more. Further training was recommended regarding aspects of work roles for key transition personnel. VAC and VRC surveys are appended. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED324581

Cooperation Between Special Education and Vocational Rehabilitation: An Examination of Role Functions, Inservice Needs, Attitudes and Values

1989-90

A research study conducted by Missouri LINC in cooperation with the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Division of Special Education and Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.

CE052141

Cooperation Between Special Education and Vocational Rehabilitation: An Examination of Role Functions, Inservice Needs, Attitudes and Values

Marinell Miller, Ed.S.
Research Assistant

Department of Special Education
and
Department of Practical Arts and Vocational-Technical Education

College of Education
University of Missouri-Columbia

This study was supported in whole by funds from the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Divisions of Vocational and Adult Education and Special Education. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policies of the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and no official endorsement should be inferred. The study could not have been completed without the support and cooperation of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.

June, 1990

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was conducted in cooperation with the State Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Division of Special Education and Division of Vocational and Adult Education.

Mr. Graham Williams, Division of Special Education and Mr. Bud Heineman, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation were instrumental in the approval of the study and review of the instruments. Dr. Arden Boyer-Stephens, Director of Missouri LINC, provided valuable assistance in conceptualizing, implementing and interpreting this research. The Region VII Rehabilitation Continuing Education Program was instrumental in providing access to VAC's and VRC's in the states of Kansas and Iowa for piloting of the instrument. Special thanks are due this group for their candid comments regarding the instrument and cooperative programming in their states. A committee of faculty at the University of Missouri were especially helpful in reviewing the research design and instrumentation. Members of this committee were: Richard W. Thoreson, CarolAnne Kardash, C.D. Roberts, Michael J. Patton and Pat Frazier. Heather Bossaller is especially thanked for her skillful formatting of the research instrument and Angie Hines produced the fine work on formatting this report.

Missouri LINC recognizes all the VACs and VRCs across the state who took time to complete the instrument and whose work exemplifies cooperation and excellence in furthering the potential, participation and productivity of Missouri youth with disabilities.

Cooperation Between Special Education and Vocational Rehabilitation: An Examination of Role Functions, Inservice Needs, Attitudes and Values

Introduction 1

Purpose of the Study 2

Method:

Results 3
Purpose 1 4
Purpose 2 7
Purpose 3 12
Purpose 4 18
Purpose 5 22

Summary of Findings 25

Recommendations and Applications 27

References 28

Appendix A 30
Qualitative Data Regarding Barriers to Cooperation

Appendix B 35
The Index of Coordination

Appendix C 36
The Missouri Cooperative Agreement

INTRODUCTION

The Cooperative Education Program has existed in the state of Missouri since 1965. The program is founded on the basic premise that students with disabilities can benefit from skill training that emphasizes vocational experiences in the secondary school setting. The primary coordination of the program is based on a cooperative agreement between the state Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR) and the local education agency (LEA). This agreement (see Appendix C) outlines the responsibilities of each party and specifically identifies the Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor (VRC) as the primary agent of the state-federal vocational rehabilitation system, and the Vocational Adjustment Coordinator (VAC) as the primary agent of the special education service system. Together these individuals work to assist in a smooth transition from school to work for the student with a disability.

Research has suggested that cooperative agreements between special education and vocational rehabilitation are profitable and serve to extend the capacities of both groups (Sigelman, Flexer, Spanhel and DeSanctis, 1979). Further outcome data suggest that cooperative efforts between these systems can substantially benefit the student with a disability. Although Bullis and Foss (1983) documented that many cooperative work study programs were declining in the early 1980's, the program in the state of Missouri remains a strong mechanism to promote transitional services for youth with disabilities. As Halpern (1987) has stated:

> Current transition programs are in many ways a variation of the cooperative work-study programs that were quite popular during the 1960's and early 1970's. When these programs fell out of favor, the need for them did not cease to exist, and this need provided a context for their reincarnation under the rubric of "transition" (p. 546-547).

The strength of the cooperative program is that it encourages a collaborative relationship between two important service systems, special education and vocational rehabilitation. The importance of this relationship has been demonstrated in the context of transition related outcomes.

Bates (1990) presents data regarding the employment status of students with mental retardation one year after school exit. When the VRC attended transition planning meetings, an employment rate of 80% was evident one year after school exit. When the VRC consulted but did not attend transition planning, an employment rate of 63% was evident, and when a VRC was not involved in transition planning this rate dropped to 42%. Clearly, these numbers suggest the importance of cooperative efforts for the student with a disability.

Literature regarding the relationships between special education and vocational rehabilitation has suggested that several barriers exist to smooth functioning. Barriers that have been noted include: differences regarding eligibility requirements (Kallsen & Kidder,

1985; Szymanski, King, Parker & Jenkins, 1989); differences in roles and responsibilities of key service personnel (Johnson & Atkins, 1987); differences in preservice training requirements (Szymanski, Hanley-Maxwell & Asselin, 1990); and differences in basic policy philosophy and values that drive the service provision of each system (DeStephano & Snauwaert, 1989; Everson, 1988; Johnson & Atkins, 1987). While differences between the two systems appear to be many, the primary workers of each system the VAC and the VRC, continue to try to meet the transitional needs of youth with disabilities. The present study was designed to examine the relationships between the two service systems and to identify factors that are related to cooperative programming between special education and vocational rehabilitation. The population for this study consisted of all vocational adjustment coordinators, state-federal vocational rehabilitation counselors assigned to cooperative education programs, and state-federal vocational rehabilitation counselors with other types of assignments in the state of Missouri.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study was designed to be descriptive in nature. Its purposes were to:

- Describe the characteristics of VAC's and VRC's in the state of Missouri.
- Assess the current functional status of the Cooperative Education Program in the state of Missouri.
- Identify areas of informational need amenable to inservice training intervention.
- Identify factors related to the cooperative efforts of the special education and state-federal vocational rehabilitation service systems.
- Examine the personal work values of workers in each system and the perceived work values of each system.

Method

To achieve the exploratory aims of the study, survey research methods were utilized. The entire population of Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors (VRC, N=145) and Vocational Adjustment Coordinators (VAC, N=147) in the state of Missouri were contacted with a copy of the Index of Coordination and cover letter explaining the purpose of the study (see Appendix B). Each individual was contacted with a personalized letter and asked to return the survey in an enclosed postage-paid envelope. A second copy of the instrument and cover memo was sent to individuals who did not return the instrument within three weeks after the designated return date.

Respondents were informed of the voluntary nature of participation and confidentiality of responses. One support staff member was designated to monitor returns and send out the follow-up instrument to non-responders. The names of subjects were kept in a locked file and at no time did the primary authors have access to identifiable subject data. Return rate after the first mailing for the total sample was 61% (VRC-67%; VAC-55%). After follow-up the total return rate rose to 77% (VRC-86%; VAC-66%). Of these numbers, useable surveys were returned by 74% of the total sample (VRC-83%; VAC-64%). For the purpose of data analysis the VRC group was partitioned into two groups. The VRC-Coop group consisted of 43 VRCs who had assignments to cooperative education programs, and the VRC-Other group consisted of 78 VRCs who had general or specialized caseload assignments. This operation allowed examination of group differences while controlling for work assignment influences. Non-useable surveys were those returned by individuals indicating, for example, that they were no longer assigned to a particular position or that they did not think the survey was applicable to them.

INSTRUMENTATION

The Index of Coordination (IC) was used to survey the subject population. The IC is a four part instrument which measures: 1) Demographics and role functions; 2) Attitudes; 3) Values, and 4) Informational knowledge.

The IC was piloted with two groups prior to administration to assess reliability and content validity concerns. Specifically, university graduate students (n=30); and vocational rehabilitation counselors and vocational adjustment coordinators (n=27) from the states of Iowa and Kansas were administered the IC. Both groups were asked to complete and comment upon the instrument. The results from the pilot studies were used to refine the psychometric properties of the scales. For example, one entire attitude scale was dropped and several items were added or deleted on some of the scales to increase reliability and/or content validity. Of importance, was the assessment of the perceptual set taken by respondents toward the attitude measurements. This analysis showed that from 88% (VAC sample) to 100% (VRC sample) of the respondents were able to accurately perceive the intended purpose of the scale directions as asking for generalizations of each system assessed. Further information on the psychometric properties of the Index of Coordination may be found in Miller (1990).

Purpose 1:

To Describe the Characteristics of VAC's and VRC's in the State of Missouri

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of VAC's, VRC's-Coop and VRC's-Other

	VAC n=96	VRC-Coop n=43	VRC-Other n=78
Gender			
Female	66.0%	46.0%	48.0%
Male	34.0%	54.0%	52.0%
Mean Age in Years	41.6	42.4	40.8
Mean Months in Current Position	97.9	98.0	106.4
Mean Years in Current Field	12.8	10.2	10.7
Education Level			
Bachelors	42.0%	2.0%	0.0%
Masters	14.0%	50.0%	57.0%
Masters +	43.0%	48.0%	43.0%
Specialist +	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Area of Highest Degree			
Special Education	72.0%	0.0%	1.0%
Vocational Education	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%
General Education	7.0%	16.0%	9.0%
Psychology/Counseling	11.0%	51.0%	60.0%
Rehabilitation Counseling	0.0%	16.0%	20.0%
Other	9.0%	16.0%	10.0%
Certification/Licensure			
None	0.0%	39.0%	39.0%
Elementary Education	65.0%	10.0%	7.0%
Secondary Education	59.0%	35.0%	29.0%
Vocational Education	8.0%	9.0%	1.0%
Special Education	93.0%	19.0%	7.0%
Counseling	12.0%	23.0%	23.0%
Administration	7.0%	13.0%	5.0%
Certified Rehabilitation Counselor	0.0%	2.0%	12.0%
Licensed Professional Counselor	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%
Other	5.0%	9.0%	5.0%

Note: Some categories do not sum to 100% due to missing data or multiple response categories.

VAC = Vocational Adjustment Coordinator
VRC-Coop = Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor-Assigned to Cooperative Education Programs
VRC-Other = Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor-with general or other caseload assignments

Purpose 1

OBSERVATION

Demographically, VAC's and VRC's are more dissimilar than they are alike. Although the gender distribution among VRC's is relatively equal, a higher percentage of VAC's are female. The groups are equivalent in age distribution and tenure in current position but VAC's have been employed in the field for a longer period of time than have VRC's.

The wide differences in educational levels, preservice training and certification status between the VAC's and VRC's are not surprising and have been described elsewhere (Szymanski et al., 1990). Although approximately equal numbers of VAC's and VRC's have "masters-degree-plus-hours", differences between the groups are centered in the number of VAC's who hold a bachelors degree (40%) and VRC's who hold master's degrees (50-57%). The state of Missouri requires the latter entry level requirements for each professional group. That such a large percentage of respondents have sought training past requirements could be evidence of the professional commitment held by each group.

The areas of training concentration for the highest degree and certification/licenses held are noteworthy in that a small percentage of each group have obtained degrees, or are certified/licensed in the opposite system's traditional area(s) of training. For example, 29-35% of the VRCs are certified in secondary education and 10% of the VACs have obtained degrees in counseling/psychology. This finding may bode well for cooperative efforts between the systems as training and certification across disciplines that could aid between-system understanding.

Purpose 2:

To Assess the Current Functional Status of the Cooperative Education Program

Table 2

Characteristics of the Cooperative Education Program

Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors (n=121)	
VRC's Not Assigned to Coop (n=78)	64.5%
Median % of "students in transition" on caseload (SD=12.7; mean=9)	5.0%
VRC's Assigned to Coop (n=43)	35.5%
Median % of caseload that is coop students (1-100 range; SD=31.2; mean=22.0)	10.0%
Percent of VRC's with 100% coop assignment	7.0%
Average number of VAC's served (1-8 range)	3.5
Median number of contacts with VAC's in the last month (0-60 range; SD=13.1; mean=9.8)	5.0
Average number of coop students on caseload (1-180 range; SD=42.3; mdn=14.5; sum=1,108)	33.1
Vocational Adjustment Coordinators (n=96)	
Median % of students referred to DVR (0-100 range; SD=33.3; mean=75%)	95.0%
Median % of students found eligible for DVR (0-100 range; SD=32.2; mean=75%)	90.0%
Median number of contact with VRC's in the last month (0-60 range; SD=9.1; mdn=7; sum=1,392)	3.0

Note: Medians (mdn) are reported for characteristics whose distributions are skewed.

Purpose 2

OBSERVATION

The majority of VRCs who responded to the survey did not have specific assignments to cooperative education programs. However with non-coop VRCs, a median of 5% of their caseloads were considered "students in transition". The distribution of this percentage is positively skewed, meaning that the majority of VRC's have small numbers of "students in transition" on their caseload. The range on this variable is from 0% to 70% with 64% of the VRCs not assigned to cooperative education programs having 5% or less of their caseload consisting of "students in transition".

This is a positive finding suggesting that, although a VRC may not have a specific work assignment to a school with a cooperative agreement, they are working with students engaged in the transition from school to work. This may suggest that the type of clients these counselors work with are not traditionally served by cooperative programs or that they work in portions of the state that are more rural in nature and therefore may not have an organized cooperative program.

VRC's who did have assignments to cooperative education programs, on average, carried a caseload that consisted of 22% (mdn=10%) coop students. Three counselors, or 7% of the sub-sample of VRCs assigned to cooperative programs, gave 100% effort towards the school program. Each VRC served, on the average, 3-4 VAC's and met or contacted each VAC about 3 times in the past month. Although there is no base rate with which to compare these numbers, they may be low given the number of students served. VRC's total estimate of students served was 1,108. Extrapolating the population that is missing due to non-respondents, the total number of cooperative education students being served by VR would be 1,230. This number is most likely slightly overestimated as it is unknown if the proportion of VRC's assigned to cooperative education programs is the same in the population as in the sample. Data provided by the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services (1985) suggested that 23% of MoDVR FY83 successful case closures were school referred, this number equalling 1,196 total students. Comparing this number to current estimates, the number of students served by the cooperative education program appears status quo.

The VACs in the sample, report that they refer the majority of their students to vocational rehabilitation and that most of these students are found eligible (mdn=90.0). These positive findings suggest that VACs are able to screen students who are referred to achieve a high eligibility rate.

The VACs reported that they serve 1,392 students in the cooperative education program. The number of students served in the average school program is 12 yet the range is quite large, suggesting that there is quite a bit of variability in program size across the state.

Table 3

Role Functions of VAC's & VRC's: Average % of Time Spent in Each Activity During Work Week.

	Missouri 1990		Texas 1979*	
	VAC % range	VRC % range	VAC % range	VRC % range
Teaching and Classroom Preparation	49.0% (0-95)	-	23.0% (0-75)	-
Reporting and Record Keeping	9.0% (0-50)	28.0% (0-75)	9.0% (0-30)	23.0% (3-70)
Vocational Assessment and/or Counseling	5.0% (0-50)	17.0% (0-50)	-	-
Developing Work Stations and Work Placement	6.0% (0-50)	3.0% (0-30)	14.0% (3-75)	10.0% (0-25)
Supervision of Students on Work Placement	8.0% (0-65)	3.0% (0-30)	14.0% (3-75)	15.0% (0-75)
Personal-Social Counseling	7.0% (0-30)	10.0% (0-50)	11.0% (3-75)	13.0% (0-33)
Public Relations	4.0% (0-20)	6.0% (0-25)	5.0% (0-65)	4.0% (0-13)
Contacts with Parents	5.0% (0-20)	-	7.0% (0-20)	11.0% (0-25)
Meetings with VRC/VAC	3.0% (0-15)	10.0% (0-50)	5.0% (2-30)	23.0% (3-76)
Transit	2.0% (0-10)	5.0% (0-30)	9.0% (3-50)	-
Other	4.0% (0-70)	4.0% (0-93)	3.0% (0-25)	1.0% (0-20)

*Seligman et al., 1979.

Purpose 2

OBSERVATION

Table three compares the current Missouri role function data to data gathered in 1979 in Texas. The data suggests that the functions of VACs and VRCs may have changed over the past eleven years.

VACs in Missouri appear to be spending more time in classroom teaching and preparation; less time supervising students on work sites; and less time developing work stations than those VACs sampled in 1979. Likewise VRCs from Missouri appear to be spending less time supervising students on work sites or developing work stations than those VRCs sampled in 1979. Similarly, the amount of time VACs and VRCs spend meeting together in a typical work week appears to have declined. The amount of time each group reports regarding time spent in record keeping and reporting appears substantially the same across the two samples.

This data may in part be explained by the Szymanski, King, Parker & Jenkins (1989) report which documents decline in cooperative education programs around 1978 when the federal government issued tightened mandates regarding matched funding practices between the systems.

This data does provide a baseline for evaluation of what roles are being performed by which group on average. The range of time spent in each activity appears to vary greatly across the state. This information could be useful for decision makers in setting priorities regarding which functions are best performed singularly by each worker and which functions are best shared cooperatively.

Purpose 3:

To Identify Areas of Informational Need Amenable to Inservice Training

Table 4a

Group Differences in Informational Knowledge Regarding Aspects of the Missouri Cooperative Agreement and Systems Operation

	VRC Assigned to Coop	VAC	VRC Not Assigned to Coop
VR Eligibility			
At what age may students with disabilities apply for VR services? (Answer in years) +++	15.8	16.0	16.5
VR may find student eligible based on a diagnosis of "behavior disorder" if other eligibility criteria are met	3.0	2.4	2.9*
A behavior assessment is a part of eligibility determination for LD students	1.5	2.1	1.6
A student with an IQ of 86 who has no other disabilities may be eligible for VR services if other eligibility criteria are met	4.0	3.0	4.0*
A VR counselor may be involved in special education consultation and planning as early as the freshman year	1.8	1.7	2.7*
The school/VR cooperative agreement lifts restrictions of confidentiality regarding communication about the student	3.2	3.4	3.1
A student that the school system classifies as LD is automatically eligible for VR services	4.8	4.5	4.6

1=Yes, I'm sure; 2=Yes, I think so; 3=Don't know; 4=No, I don't think so; 5=No, I'm sure

* Indicates mean difference at $p < .05$.

+++ 7% indicated no age requirement.

Table 4b

Group Differences in Informational Knowledge Regarding Aspects of the Missouri Cooperative Agreement and Systems Operation

	VRC Assigned to Coop	VAC	VRC Not Assigned to Coop
VR Responsibilities and Services			
The DVR will provide supported employment services for up to 11 months	4.1	2.9	3.6*
Job placement is the responsibility of the VRC in coop programs ++	3.0	3.4	2.8*
VR can provide financing for training that the school district could supply	4.2	3.6	3.7*
The Individualized Written Rehabilitation Plan (IWRP) is always written to correspond to the IEP	3.1	2.3	3.2
The individualized education program (IEP) is a required part of the VR case file	1.5	1.5	2.5*
School System Responsibilities and Services			
School districts are required to evaluate students every two years	4.2	4.7	3.4*
The VAC is responsible for job development for coop students +	1.5	1.7	2.2*
Job follow-up is the responsibility of the VAC in coop programs ++	1.8	1.7	2.5*
Vocational readiness training is a strongly emphasized part of a school's training curriculum	3.0	1.9	2.7*
It is the responsibility of the VAC to locate job coaches for students engaged in supported employment	3.8	3.2	3.2*

1=Yes, I'm sure; 2=Yes, I think so; 3=Don't know; 4=No, I don't think so; 5=No, I'm sure

* Indicates mean difference at $p < .05$.

\+ 1% indicated shared responsibility
++ 2% indicated shared responsibility

Purpose 3

OBSERVATION

The majority of misperceptions regarding informational knowledge about the cooperative education agreement appear to come from VRCs not assigned specifically to work with the program. This is not an unusual finding. However, some noteworthy responses were made by general caseload VRCs. This group was significantly less sure of the fact that a VRC can be involved in special education consultation and planning in the freshman year. This involvement is not predicated upon being assigned to a coop caseload, for, as we have seen earlier (Table 2), the average general caseload counselor has a caseload that consists of 5% "students in transition".

VR ELIGIBILITY

All three groups suggest that a student may apply for VR services around age 16, 7% of the sample indicated no age requirements. There are, in fact, no specific age requirements for some VR services. The VRC can be involved in planning in the freshman year but perhaps not officially open a case until the student is of working age.

The "behavior disorders" diagnosis remains a problem area. The VAC score suggests that most VACs are not sure if a student with a behavior disorder could be found eligible, given other eligibility criteria are met. Both VR groups, on average, answered "don't know" to eligibility regarding students with behavior disorders. This question may have posed an interpretation problem for some respondents. Yet this is one diagnostic category that clearly is not utilized in the VR system and requires reclassification for a student to be eligible. It appears this may remain a point of confusion for some VACs and VRCs.

The VR eligibility criteria for a mental disability appears to be a point of confusion for most VACs in the sample. The VRCs are clear that an IQ of 86 is too high for eligibility determination but VACs on average "don't know". Criteria for students with learning disabilities appear to be understood by all groups, both regarding the required behavior assessment, and the implications regarding differences in LEA versus VR categorization.

There may be some issues regarding what restrictions on confidentiality are lifted when a school enters into a cooperative agreement with VR. All groups of respondents, on average, answered "don't know" to "no" to the suggestion that the cooperative agreement lifts confidentiality restrictions. The cooperative agreement signed by each party (see Appendix C) states that the VRC is to provide a copy of the IWRP to the LEA and that the LEA is to provide access to school records and evaluations. It appears that just how far confidentiality of student records extends may need to be addressed. Confusion on this issue could create some substantial communication barriers for VACs and VRCs.

VR RESPONSIBILITIES AND SERVICES

The length of time that VR can provide supported employment services may be unclear

to VACs and VRCs not assigned to coops. VACs on average are not aware that supported employment services can last up to 9 months and VRCs not assigned to coops are less sure about this time frame than VRCs who do have coop assignments.

The responsibility of job placement is also an unclear area for VRCs and VACs involved in coop programs. The Missouri Cooperative Agreement does not specifically spell out operational responsibilities regarding job placement activities. However, Boyer-Stephens (1988) in the Missouri VAC Handbook suggest that VACs "secure training sites and supervise on the job training" while VRCs "assist in job placement" (p. 105). The fact that VRCs assigned to coop programs on average answered "don't know", and, VACs tended to answer "don't know" suggesting that placement is VR's responsibility, identifies a primary area of confusion regarding coordination of placement activities.

Both VRCs and VACs working in cooperative programs relate that the IEP is a required part of the case file. However, it is surprising to note that on average VRCs assigned to cooperative programs "don't know" if the IWRP is written to correspond with the IEP. This is one area that the Missouri Cooperative Agreement does operationalize such that the IWRP should be written to correlate with the IEP to assure common goals and objectives.

SCHOOL SYSTEM RESPONSIBILITIES AND SERVICES

Both VACs and VRCs assigned to cooperative programs agree that job development is the responsibility of the VAC. Further, they also agree that job follow-up is the responsibility of the VAC. It is important to note that a small percentage of respondents indicated that these responsibilities are shared by the VAC and VRC. Both groups also are clear that the school requires evaluations at time periods different from 2 years (evaluations of students are conducted every 3 years by LEA's).

It is interesting to note that on average, VRCs assigned to cooperative programs "don't know" if vocational readiness training is strongly emphasized in the coop programs. VACs' in general, are clear that this is an important part of their programming.

Finally, supported employment appears to be confusing at this point for VACs. VRCs are in general relatively sure that VACs do not locate job coaches while VACs are less sure of their role in this.

SUMMARY OF INFORMATIONAL NEEDS:

VR ELIGIBILITY

*Age requirements for application for VR services indicate clearer definitions are needed regarding differences between consultation and the open/active case in VR system.

*Diagnostic nosology needs clarification regarding "behavior disorder" terminology used by schools but not VR.

*Diagnostic nosology regarding IQ cutoffs for a mental disability needs clarification for VACs.

*Clarification is needed regarding confidentiality limits for information sharing under the cooperative agreement.

RESPONSIBILITIES AND SERVICES OF EACH GROUP

*Supported employment rules and roles of each professional require clarification.

*Job placement responsibilities are unclear for each group and require clarification.

*The correlation of the IWRP to correspond to the IEP needs to be clarified for VRCs.

Purpose 4:

To Identify Factors Related to the Cooperative Efforts of the Special Education and the State-Federal Vocational Rehabilitation Service Systems

Table 5

Correlations Among Variables Important to Cooperative Programming

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Perceived cooperation between systems	-	-.22	-.40	.19	.21	-.19
2. Attitudes towards special education		-	.28	-.09	-.27	.13
3. Attitudes towards vocational rehabilitation			-	-.19	-.32	-.07
4. Personal values				-	.25	.09
5. Perceived system values					-	.16
6. Type of worker[a]						-

Note: For intercorrelations with absolute values of .13 - .17, $p < .05$; For those of .18 - .20, $p < .01$; for those greater than .21, $p < .001$.

n=215.

[a] 1=VRC, 2=VAC, Pearson product moment coefficients used for all correlations except "type of worker" where point biserial correlations are reported.

Purpose 4

COMMENT

To examine purpose four all of the respondents were asked to: 1) rate their attitudes towards the "State Vocational Rehabilitation Service System" and the "State Special Education System"; 2) rate the importance of a series of work values for themselves personally; 3) rate a series of work values as they perceived them to be important to the system they worked for; and 4) rate the perceived level of cooperation between the two service systems.

Table 5 displays the strength of correlations for variables that were related to respondents ratings of perceived levels of cooperation between the two systems. This table suggests that both groups of respondents hold attitudes towards the "vocational rehabilitation system" and "the special education system" that suggest that they think both are less than responsive (ie., positive attitudes decrease as perceptions of cooperation increase). But, in spite of these attitudes, relationships of cooperation between the systems are rated highly. These are surprising relationships which are not easily explained.

These findings are in part explained by the Haynes and Justice (1988) study which examined organizational barriers to transition. Examining a sample of educators, agency personnel (including JPTA, VR, MR/DD, Regional Centers, Rehabilitation), advocacy groups and parents, Haynes and Justice (1988) identified several program operation and system delivery barriers to transition. Eighteen barriers were identified by their study in the area of program operation and system delivery. These barriers are provided below and are listed in the rank order of importance found by Haynes and Justice (1988).

1) Community based training, transition activities are not a program priority.
2) Agency personnel are overly concerned with meeting their own placement quotas.
3) There is a lack of agency planning.
3) Agency staffing patterns are inadequate, based upon student or program need.
4) A lack of leadership exists from state authorities. (Governor, Legislature, State Departments)
4) Services delivery patterns are not client oriented.
5) Agencies provide little or no planning for changes.
5) Agencies have an inadequate number of staff per client due to heavy case loads.
5) Agencies delivery of services is inconsistent with the capability of client.
6) Agencies provide little evaluation of their program operation's effect on the client.
7) Many obstacles to community based training exist such as transportation, insurance, etc.
7) Student training is insufficient or inadequate.
7) A built-in conflict exists between community based training and fulfillment of academic requirements.
8) Current transition planning does not deal with the whole person's adult needs (work, leisure, etc.).
8) Agency staff are "turf" oriented.
9) There is not any one agency responsible for leading transition efforts.
10) Training curriculum that does exist for clients is not related to their job placement.
10) Agencies attempt to maintain the status quo.

(Haynes & Justice, 1988, p. 8-9)

Many of the barriers found by Haynes and Justice (1988) were written responses listed by respondents in the current study as barriers to cooperation between the two service systems (see Appendix A). Examination of the barriers presented by Haynes and Justice (1988) may help clarify the attitudes found in the current study toward each system.

Generalization from the second pilot study in this report suggests that respondents were thinking of each system in general when providing attitudinal ratings (see Method). As perceptions of cooperation between systems increased, attitudes regarding the lack of responsiveness held toward each system also increased. For example, VACs and VRCs who stated that the VR and Special Education system were: slow, untimely, inconsistent and restricted; and unwilling, unfriendly and dissonant; also rated cooperation between the systems highly. These findings suggest that a significant "systems effect" may be occurring with each of these groups of respondents. The VACs and VRCs seem to be saying that they perceive cooperation between the systems to be occurring in spite of problems that they see with each of the systems individually.

These findings appear to be related to the Haynes and Justice (1988) barriers of operation and system delivery. For example, the top barrier identified was "community based training, transition activities are not a program priority". This seems related to the attitudes of a restricted, untimely, slow system. Likewise, "service delivery patterns are not client oriented" (Haynes & Justice, 1988) appears to be related to the attitudes towards the system as less than responsive.

A multivariate analysis of variance was performed on this data to identify if differences were present among VACs, VRCs assigned to cooperative education programs (VRC-Coop) and VRCs with general or other caseload assignments (VRC-Other). It was found that there were no significant differences between VACs and VRCs assigned to cooperative education programs in attitudes held toward either system, personal values, or perceived values of each of their systems. Differences were found between VACs and VRCs-Other, in that, VRCs-Other held less positive attitudes towards the special education system and felt the values measured were less important to their system. These finding hold significance for cooperative transition programming.

Halpern (1987) documents that the face of transition is changing. Cooperative education programs are but a portion of transition programming that exists in the 1990's. For instance, a school without a coop program may refer a student to the state-federal vocational rehabilitation program and a VRC-Other, might receive the referral as a part of the general caseload. The pattern of differences found among groups suggests that such a referral could present attitudinal and values based barriers.

Conner and Becker (1979) document that cooperation between groups is highest when value similarity exists. This suggests that cooperation between VACs and VRCs-Coop would function smoothly while cooperation between VACs and VRCs-Other would proceed less than optimally. The important emphasis here is that no differences in personal values was found among groups while perceived system values were viewed significantly different by the VACs and VRC-Other. These findings suggest that personal values might prove to be less of a barrier than perceived values of the system and attitudes towards special education. These findings also suggest that if a state has a cooperative education program, a VRC-Coop might be the best match to assure smooth cooperative efforts. Finally, the findings suggest that inservice training for VRCs-Other might be fruitful in addressing their less than positive attitudes towards the special education system.

Purpose 5:

To Examine the Personal Work Values of Workers in Each System and the Perceived Work Values of Each System

Table 6

Top 5 Personal Work Values

VAC	VRC-Coop	VRC-Other
Accomplishment 73%	Accomplishment 68%	Accomplishment 73%
Capable 53%	Helpful 56%	Economic Returns 49%*
Responsible 52%*	Capable 49%	Capable 45%
Helpful 48%	Economic Returns 44%*	Helpful 44%
Independence 32%	Responsible 35%	Intellectual Stimulation 32%*

Top 5 Perceived Work Values of Each System

VAC ranking Special Education	VRC-Coop ranking VR System	VRC-Other ranking VR System
Capable 70%	Efficiency 88%*	Efficiency 93%*
Efficiency 63%*	Capable 77%	Responsible 71%
Responsible 62%	Helpful 63%	Capable 69%
Accomplishment 37%	Responsible 58%	Helpful 49%
Helpful 37%	Equality 49%	Equality 35%

Note: Percentages represent the % of each group who ranked the value within the top five.

* Indicates areas of significant differences among groups at $p < .05$, using ChiSquare tests.

Purpose 5

OBSERVATION

The work values of members of each system were examined based on the conclusions of DeStephano and Snauwaert (1989). These authors suggested, based on a review of the legislative history of each system, that special education is characterized by the value base of equality and vocational rehabilitation is characterized by the value base of efficiency. Rankings of values were examined as these provide finer discriminations in value research when compared to ratings (Alwin & Krosnick, 1985).

Examination of the top five personal work values ranked by members of each system shows that there are few differences between the groups in values. More VRCs ranked economic returns in their top five important personal work values than did VACs. VACs ranked the personal work value of responsible in the top five values more often that did VRCs and, VRCs with assignments other than coop, ranked intellectual stimulation as more important.

Differences between the groups regarding their perceptions of values important to each of their systems, likewise, suggest few differences between VACs and VRCs. Although efficiency as a perceived value important to the systems was ranked highly by all groups, more VRC ranked it in the top five than did VACs. VRCs assigned to cooperative education programs thought the VR system valued helpfulness more than did the other groups.

DeStephano and Snauwaert (1989) concluded that, because of differences in the value bases that direct each system, special education should assume responsibility for transition efforts. They concluded this because the interface of a system based on efficiency could not serve the number of clients/students necessary who were referred from a system based on equality. The current findings do not support this hypothesis and suggest that VRCs view their system as valuing both efficiency and equality. Similarly, VACs view the special education system as valuing efficiency.

There were few differences between the workers of each system in rankings of the importance of personal work values, and those differences noted do not seem to mitigate against cooperative interactions between the systems.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

OVERVIEW

The population for this study consisted of all vocational adjustment coordinators, state-federal vocational rehabilitation counselors assigned to work with cooperative education programs, and state-federal vocational rehabilitation counselors with other types of assignments in the state of Missouri. The return rate for the survey was 77% for the total sample. It was the purpose of the study to: describe characteristics of VACs and VRCs; assess the functional status of the coop program; identify areas of informational needs; identify factors related to perceptions of cooperation between the systems; and to examine differences between the groups in personal work values and perceived values of each system. This section provides an overview of the results of the study and recommendations based on the findings.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLES

1) Differences in the gender distributions of the samples showed greater numbers of VACs were females while the proportion of males to females in the VRC samples were more equal.

2) VACs on average have been employed in special education for a longer period of time than VRCs have been employed in their field.

3) While approximately equal numbers of VACs and VRCs have educational levels at the masters + level, more VACs have bachelors degrees while VRCs in general have at least a masters degree.

4) Patterns of certification and licensure vary across the groups with some evidence of cross discipline training.

FUNCTIONAL STATUS OF THE COOP PROGRAM

1) A total of 35.5% of the VRC respondents had coop assignments. The percent of their caseload that consisted of coop students ranged from 1-100%.

2) VRCs who had other assignments (not coop) said a median of 5% of their caseload consisted of "students in transition".

3) The average coop program serves 12 students with a range of 1-70 students per program.

4) VACs most often refer 95% of their students to the DVR and most often 90% are found eligible for VR services.

5) Compared to data gathered in 1979 in Texas, the Missouri sample suggests that VACs are spending more time teaching and less time supervising students on work sites, or developing work stations. VRCs assigned to coops likewise appear to be spending less time on job development or supervision.

INFORMATIONAL NEEDS

1) Clarification is needed regarding differences between consultation provided by VR and when a case can be opened by VR.

2) Diagnostic nosology regarding "behavior disorder" terminology and criteria for "mental disability" is needed.

3) Clarification is required regarding the workings of confidentiality limits for information shared under the cooperative agreement.

4) Responsibilities and roles of VACs and VRCs in supported employment require clarification.

5) Job placement responsibilities of VACs and VRCs require clarification.

6) The correlation of the IWRP to correspond to the IEP needs clarification for VRCs.

COOPERATION BETWEEN SPECIAL EDUCATION & VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

1) Perceptions of cooperation among the groups were related to shared attitudes regarding the responsiveness of each system characterized as being rather slow moving and unfriendly.

2) VACs and VRCs assigned to cooperative education programs demonstrated consensus in attitudes, personal value, and perceived system values.

3) VACs and VRCs not assigned to cooperative education programs held significantly different attitudes towards special education and perceptions of their system's values.

GROUP DIFFERENCES IN PERSONAL & PERCEIVED SYSTEM VALUES

1) Overall there were more similarities between groups in values than there were differences.

2) VRCs personally valued economic returns more than did VACs.

3) VACs personally valued responsibility more than did VRCs.

4) VRCs assigned to caseloads other than coop valued intellectual stimulation more than other groups.

5) Although efficiency was ranked highly by all groups more VRCs saw their system as valuing it more that did VACs.

6) VRCs assigned to coops ranked the system as valuing helpfulness higher than did other groups.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND APPLICATIONS

COOPERATION

Cooperation appears to be predicated more by personological similarities than differences. This information can be used to direct administrators and policy planners in developing systems that encourage cooperation. The finding that workers of both systems hold attitudes that their systems are less than responsive suggests that within system operations may need to be addressed. Finally, the findings of this study hold a warning for researchers examining cooperation at the policy level. While policy and operations examinations may suggest barriers to cooperation in transition, workers in transition seem to find ways to confront these barriers on a personal level. This study suggested, through correlational techniques, that similarities in personal values and attitudes towards the system are related to cooperation.

INSERVICE TRAINING

Further training is indicated regarding aspects of work roles and responsibilities for key transition personnel. While several aspects of roles and responsibilities appear to have been worked out among VACs and VRCs, areas related to: supported employment; job placement; information sharing and confidentiality between systems; and diagnostic nosology differences appear to require further clarification.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR THE MISSOURI PROGRAM

This study provided an overview of cooperative efforts between special education and vocational rehabilitation in providing transitional services for youth with disabilities. Areas of future exploration that could be addressed are as follows.

1) Development of a model program guide for implementing cooperative education programs including operational goals for program development, implementation and evaluation.

2) Further research that examines the outcomes of cooperative programming including employment outcomes of students and community and social outcomes.

3) Examination of the types of students served in the cooperative education programs to identify future needs.

4) Exploration regarding supported employment models that have worked across the state within the context of cooperative programming, and development of indicators which predict success.

5) Consideration should be given to changing the name of the Missouri Cooperative Education Program which reflects the emphasis of the program on transitional activities that furthers the potential, participation and productivity of youth with disabilities in society (OSERS, 1990).

References

Alwin, D.F & Krosnick, J.A. (1985). The measurement of values in surveys: A comparison of ratings and rankings. Public Opinion Quarterly, 49, 535-552.

Bates, P. (Ed.) (1990). The role of the rehabilitation counselors in transition. Transition in Illinois. (Available from Illinois Transition Project, SIU, Carbondale, IL 62901).

Boyer-Stephens, A. (1988). Vocational adjustment coordinators handbook. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri, Missouri LINC.

Bullis, M. & Foss, G. (1983). Cooperative work study programs in vocational rehabilitation: Results of a national study. Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 26, 349-352.

DeStephano, L. & Snauwaert, D. (1989). A value-critical approach to transition policy analysis. Urbana-Champaign, IL: Secondary Transition Intervention Effectiveness Institute.

Everson, J.M. (1988). An analysis of federal and state policy on transition from school to adult life for youth with disabilities. In P. Wehman & M.S. Moon (Eds.), Vocational rehabilitation and supported employment (pp. 67-78). Baltimore: Brookes.

Halpern, A.A. (1987). From school to adult living: A forum on issues and trends. In G.M. Clark and H.E. Knowlton (Eds.) The transition from school to adult life, Exceptional Children, 53, 546-554.

Haynes, J. & Justice, T. (1988). Organizational barriers to transition: Summary. Sacramento, CA: Education Transition Center.

Johnson, S. & Atkins, B.J. (1987). Building bridges: Transition from school to work for youth who are disabled. Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling, 18, 15-20.

Kallsen, P.G. & Kidder, S.B. (1985). VR: Perspective on transition. American Rehabilitation, 11(3), 25-30.

Miller, M. (1990). Values, attitudes and cooperation between school systems and vocational rehabilitation personnel involved in the transition from school to work for youth with disabilities. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, Columbia.

Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services (1990). Future directions in special education programs. OSERS News in Print, 3(1), 1-5.

Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services (1985). Cooperative programs for transition from school to work. Washington, DC: Author.

Seligman, C.K., Flexer, R.W., Spanhel, C.L. & DeSanctis, M. (1979). Rehabilitation's partnership with the schools in vocational programming for handicapped youth: A survey. Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling, 10, 208-213.

Szymanski, E.M., Hanely-Maxwell, C., Asselin, S. (1990). Rehabilitation counseling, special education and vocational special needs education: Three transition disciplines. Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, 13(1), 29-38.

Szymanski, E.M., King, J., Parker, R.M. & Jenkins, W.M. (1989). The state-federal rehabilitation program: Interface with special education. Exceptional Children, 56, 70-77.

Appendix A

Qualitative Data Regarding Barriers to Cooperation

Qualitative Data Regarding Barriers to Cooperation

Respondents were asked to comment on the question **"What, if any, barriers do you feel impact the cooperative efforts of these two systems (sic. special education and vocational rehabilitation).** A total of 68 VACs (71% of the sample) and 43 VRCs (35% of the sample) provided written responses. The responses were organized into themes using the Haynes and Justice (1988) categories of barriers. Some additional themes were produced by this sample. The themes are reported with barriers eliciting the greatest number of comments first. To protect respondents confidentiality written comments are paraphrased and summarized.

BARRIERS TO COOPERATION AS REPORTED BY VACs

PROGRAM OPERATION/SYSTEM DELIVERY

Thirty one comments were placed in this category. Examples of comments in this theme are:

*Lack of release time to develop job sites or other activities (12).
*Slow movement of VR process, too much red tape (6).
*Lack of support or encouragement from LEA (3).
*VR caseloads are too high and geographical area so large that individual involvement is reduced (3).
*Administrators of each system don't work well together.
*VR, Special Education and Regular Education mesh is different due to mainstreaming which reduces time for work placement for LD students.
*VR system is complicated (3).
*Continuity of services over summer months is problematic (2).

COLLABORATION

Sixteen comments were placed in this section. Examples of comments in this theme are:

*Special education is not as helpful as DVR.
*VAC has to initiate communication (2).
*More frequent communication is needed (5).
*Cooperation from local district level is difficult (5).
*Information that can be shared between systems is unclear and causes break-down of communication (3).
*Services of both systems overlap and could be combined.

ELIGIBILITY

Eleven comments were placed in this section. Examples of comments in this theme are:

*The criteria used for behavior disorder is unclear (2).
*The length of time for certification of students is too long (3).
*Not being able to place student on the job site until paperwork is completed is problematic.

*Consistent guidelines for LD needs to be established by state administrators (3).
*VR needs to consider working with students in the 70-85 IQ range. In our school they're failing.
*Differences between school and VR requirements for handicapping conditions slow things down.

PERSONALITY

Eight comments were included under this category. Examples of comments in this theme are:

*Our past VRC didn't like working in our area.
*Our VRC is cynical and pessimistic and unwilling to participate in our transition work.
*A good VR counselor is the key ingredient to a successful coop program (3).
*Personality conflicts and failure to work for the best interest of the student.
*Good rapport established by school and VR counselor is essential.
*Individuals who can't communicate.

FUNDING

Six comments were included under this category. Examples of comments in this theme are:

*Parental earning restrictions are problematic in obtaining financial help for job training or school (2).
*New financial guidelines have resulted in special needs students not being referred for services.
*Funding for transportation is sometimes greater than the cost of training, this is a problem.
*Many employers will employ students only when VR is paying the bill.
*It was better when VR paid $2/hour for all job placements. It encouraged the kids to get their own jobs at minimum wage. There's not the motivation there was before.

RURAL JOB FINDING

Six comments were placed in this category. Examples of comments in this theme are:

*Small rural areas don't have many possibilities for job sites (4).
*Lack of work ethic and motivation is problematic in our area.
*Our rural area has few options for students who don't work out well.

INCONSISTENCIES

Five comments were included in this section. Examples of this theme are:

*There are different interpretations by different offices.
*A new VRC has totally different ideas, answers and programs than the previous one, this is disruptive (4).

BARRIERS TO COOPERATION AS REPORTED BY VRCs

PROGRAM OPERATION/SYSTEM DELIVERY

Twenty-two comments were placed in this category. Examples of comments in this theme are as follows:

*VR policy is edged in granite and flexibility in attempting to offer services is not accepted.
*School systems have difficulty maintaining an effective atmosphere to utilize the VAC for the good of students (3).
*Coop caseload is a small part of general caseload but requires more time than can be given.
*Too much documentation (2).
*VR counselor not invited to IEP meetings.
*Schools won't let VACs have time off campus that they need (3).
*VR needs to be involved earlier than what usually happens.
*Bureaucracy, one on both sides (2).
*VR & Special Ed. rules collide (2).
*Differing rules applied at local level which are different from the state guidelines.
*Each system focuses on different goals.
*VR involvement with schools is voluntary depending on the school administrator. This is inappropriate because then many schools won't make VR services available to students.
*Schools don't understand VRs community perspective, labor force perspective and state government perspective. The public schools view VR as a cure all.
*Time is limited for both groups (3).

COLLABORATION

Eleven comments were grouped in this section. Examples of comments are as follows:

*Communication is poor (6).
*Misunderstandings about what VR can and can't do (4).
*VACs don't cooperate well with DVR.

ELIGIBILITY

Ten comments were grouped in this section. Examples of comments are as follows:

*Guidelines on eligibility are a barrier.
*Each system has its own guidelines and policies on eligibility (5).
*Misunderstandings of qualification for services and scope of services.
*Timelines of testing restrict evaluations, some schools won't test if it's not time for re-evaluation. This slows the process down.
*Differences between systems regarding LD eligibility.
*School changes in EMH criteria have lessened the number of students for VR.

Two VR counselors mentioned personality, one mentioned rural job finding, and one mentioned inconsistencies as barriers to cooperative programming. These comments were similar to those of VACs mentioned previously.

SUMMARY

The top 2 categories in which most comments fell were program operation/system delivery and collaboration for both groups. Eligibility requirements was the third most frequently mentioned barrier. In general, the comments seemed to reflect frustration by professionals regarding lack of time for each worker and problems with communication between professionals. Differences between each system's criteria for eligibility was also viewed as problematic. Three additional themes of barriers to cooperation were mentioned by this sample that were not identified by Haynes and Justice (1988). These areas were personality conflicts, inconsistencies and problems with job finding in rural areas.

Appendix B

The Index of Coordination

VRC

Index of Coordination

Definitions:

VAC - Vocational Adjustment Coordinator - the agent of the special education service system.

VRC - Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor - the agent of the state federal vocational rehabilitation service system.

Part I. Demographics

Please complete all items in the space provided.

Time in current position: . . . . . **Years**_____ **Months**_____

Years in current field: . . . . . ( )

Highest Degree: . . . . . ( )

1) Bachelors 3) Masters + hours
2) Masters 4) Specialist or higher

Area of highest degree earned: . . . . . ( )

1) Special Education 3) General Education 5) Rehabilitation Counseling
2) Vocational Education 4) Psychology/Counseling 6) Other

What certifications or licenses do you hold? Circle all that apply.

1) None 3) Secondary 5) Special ed. 7) Administration 9) LPC
2) Elementary 4) Vocational 6) Counseling 8) CRC 10) Other

Gender: . . . . . ( )

1) Female 2) Male

Age in years: . . . . . ( )

Are you currently assigned to a co-operative education program? . . . . . ( )

1) Yes 2) No

If Yes

a) Please estimate what percentage of your current case load are co-op students . . . . (%)

b) Please estimate the total <u>number</u> of contacts (ie. written, telephone, conferences) you have had in the past month with the Vocational Adjustment Coordinators (VAC) with whom you are working . . . . . ( )

c) How many VAC's do you currently serve . . . . . ( )

d) About how many students are on your caseload . . . . . ( )

Please estimate the percentage of your work week spent in the following activities (total = 100%).

Percent		Percent	
____	Meetings with VACs	____	Supervision of Students on Work Placements
____	Vocational Counseling and/or assessment	____	Transit
____	Reporting - Recording Keeping	____	Public Relations
____	Personal-Social Counseling	____	Other (please list_____
____	Developing New Work Stations and Work Placements		_____)

If No

a) Please estimate the percentage of your caseload that may be considered "students in transition" (persons exiting from the school system) . . . . . (%)

Part II.

The following items require you to respond regarding systems. A concept heading is provided for each set of items. You should think about this concept as you answer each item. Work quickly, and answer according to what the concept means to you.

Here is how you use the scale:

If you feel the concept is quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale, you should place your mark as follows:

	This				Not this		
Hot	X	:	:	:	X	:	Cold

Place your mark in the middle of spaces, not on the boundaries. The direction toward which you mark depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seem most characteristic of the system you are judging.
Work quickly. There are no right or wrong answers.

A. Think about the State Special Education System as you answer.

friendly	:	:	:	:	:	:	unfriendly
willing	:	:	:	:	:	:	unwilling
progressive	:	:	:	:	:	:	regressive
harmonious	:	:	:	:	:	:	dissonant
successful	:	:	:	:	:	:	unsuccessful
competitive	:	:	:	:	:	:	cooperative
tough	:	:	:	:	:	:	fragile
fast	:	:	:	:	:	:	slow
strong	:	:	:	:	:	:	weak
constrained	:	:	:	:	:	:	free
eager	:	:	:	:	:	:	indifferent
prohibitive	:	:	:	:	:	:	permissive
severe	:	:	:	:	:	:	lenient
energetic	:	:	:	:	:	:	inert
active	:	:	:	:	:	:	passive
complex	:	:	:	:	:	:	simple
difficult	:	:	:	:	:	:	easy
unrestricted	:	:	:	:	:	:	restricted
courteous	:	:	:	:	:	:	discourteous
stable	:	:	:	:	:	:	changeable
consistent	:	:	:	:	:	:	inconsistent
limited	:	:	:	:	:	:	unlimited
good	:	:	:	:	:	:	bad
timely	:	:	:	:	:	:	untimely
selfless	:	:	:	:	:	:	egotistic

B. Think about the State Vocational Rehabilitation Service System as you answer.

friendly	:	:	:	:	:	:	unfriendly
willing	:	:	:	:	:	:	unwilling
progressive	:	:	:	:	:	:	regressive
harmonious	:	:	:	:	:	:	dissonant
successful	:	:	:	:	:	:	unsuccessful
competitive	:	:	:	:	:	:	cooperative
tough	:	:	:	:	:	:	fragile
fast	:	:	:	:	:	:	slow
strong	:	:	:	:	:	:	weak
constrained	:	:	:	:	:	:	free
eager	:	:	:	:	:	:	indifferent
prohibitive	:	:	:	:	:	:	permissive
severe	:	:	:	:	:	:	lenient
energetic	:	:	:	:	:	:	inert
active	:	:	:	:	:	:	passive
complex	:	:	:	:	:	:	simple
difficult	:	:	:	:	:	:	easy
unrestricted	:	:	:	:	:	:	restricted
courteous	:	:	:	:	:	:	discourteous
stable	:	:	:	:	:	:	changeable
consistent	:	:	:	:	:	:	inconsistent
limited	:	:	:	:	:	:	unlimited
good	:	:	:	:	:	:	bad
timely	:	:	:	:	:	:	untimely
selfless	:	:	:	:	:	:	egotistic

C. Work Values

Below are listed a series of values typical of workers. Use the following rating scale to rate each value according to how important it is to **you** in your work; and, how important it is to the **system** you work for.

not very important = 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **= very important**

Provide one number for each value.

	Important to you	Important to the System
1. **A sense of Accomplishment** (Lasting contribution)	( )	( )
2. **Associates** (Forming friendships with fellow workers)	( )	( )
3. **Broadmindedness** (Open minded attitude)	( )	( )
4. **Capable** (Competent, effective)	( )	( )
5. **Creativity** (Trying out new ideas)	( )	( )
6. **Intellectual Stimulation** (Solving new problems, continuing education)	( )	( )
7. **Efficiency** (Productivity)	( )	( )
8. **Equality** (Equal opportunity for all)	( )	( )
9. **Helpful** (Working for the welfare of others)	( )	( )
10. **Independence** (Self-reliance, self-sufficient)	( )	( )
11. **Economic Returns** (Raises)	( )	( )
12. **Responsible** (Dependable, reliable)	( )	( )
13. **Social Recognition** (Respect, admiration)	( )	( )
14. **Variety** (Not doing the same thing all the time)	( )	( )

Rank the top five values that are important to you.

#1_____ #4_____

#2_____ #5_____

#3_____

Rank the top five values that are important to the system.

#1_____ #4_____

#2_____ #5_____

#3_____

Part III. Informational Knowledge

A. Answer the following questions according to your level of agreement

Use the following scale:

1 = Yes, I'm sure 2 = Yes, I think so 3 = Don't know 4 = No, I don't think so 5 = No, I'm sure

- A VR counselor may be involved in special education consultation and planning as early as the freshman year . . . . . ( )
- VR may find student eligible based on a diagnosis of "behavior disorder" if other eligibility criteria are met . . . . . ( )
- A behavior assessment is a part of eligibility determination for LD students . . . . . ( )

Code_____

1 = Yes, I'm sure 2 = Yes, I think so 3 = Don't know 4 = No, I don't think so 5 = No, I'm sure

- A student with an IQ of 86 who has no other disabilities may be eligible for VR services if other eligibility criteria are met . . . . . ( )
- VR can provide financing for training that school district could supply . . . . . ( )
- A student that the school system classifies as LD is automatically eligible for VR services . . . . . ( )
- School districts are required to evaluate students every 2 years . . . . . ( )
- The VAC is responsible for job development for co-op students . . . . . ( )
- Job follow-up is the responsibility of the VAC in co-op programs . . . . . ( )
- It is the responsibility of the VAC to locate job coaches for students engaged in supported employment . . . . . ( )
- Job placement is the responsibility of the VRC in co-op programs . . . . . ( )
- The school/VR cooperative agreement lifts restrictions of confidentiality regarding communication about the student . . . . . ( )
- Vocational readiness training is a strongly emphasized part of a school's training curriculum . . . . . ( )
- The DVR will provide supported employment services for up to 11 months . . . . . ( )
- The individualized education program (IEP) is a required part of the VR case file . . . . . ( )
- The Individualized Written Rehabilitation Plan (IWRP) is always written to correspond to the IEP . . . . . ( )
- At what age may students with disabilities apply for VR services? (Answer in years) . . . . . ( )

B. In general, rate the level of the following attributes regarding relationships between special education and vocational rehabilitation personnel. Circle one.

Cooperation	Low =	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	= High
Communication		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Respect		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Understanding		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

What, if any, barriers do you feel impact the cooperative efforts of these two systems?

Thank you for your time. Please provide any further comments regarding the purpose of this survey on the back of this page.

MU, 1990

VAC

Index of Coordination

Definitions:

VRC - Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor - the agent of the state federal vocational rehabilitation service system.

VAC - Vocational Adjustment Coordinator - the agent of the special education service system.

Part I. Demographics

Please complete all items in the space provided.

Time in current position: . . . . . **Years**_____ **Months**_____

Years in current field: . . . . . ( )

Highest Degree: . . . . . ( )

1) Bachelors 3) Masters + hours
2) Masters 4) Specialist or higher

Area of highest degree earned: . . . . . ( )

1) Special Education 3) General Education 5) Rehabilitation Counseling
2) Vocational Education 4) Psychology/Counseling 6) Other

What certifications or licenses do you hold? Circle all that apply.

1) None 4) Vocational 7) Administration 10) Other
2) Elementary 5) Special education 8) CRC
3) Secondary 6) Counseling 9) LPC

Gender: . . . . . ( )

1) Female 2) Male

Age in years: . . . . . ( )

Is your assigment to co-operative education programming: . . . . . ( )

1) Full time 2) Part time

a) Please estimate the percentage of your current co-op students who are referred to the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR) . . . . . (%)

- About what percentage are found eligible for DVR . . . . . (%)

b) Please estimate the total number of contacts (ie. written, telephone, conferences) you have had in the past month with the DVR counselor assigned to your program. . . . . ( )

c) About how many co-op students do you currently work with? . . . . . ( )

Please estimate the percentage of your work week spent in the following activities (total = 100%).

Percent		Percent	
_____	Teaching and Classroom Preparation	_____	Contacts with Parents
_____	Developing Work Stations and Work Placements	_____	Public Relations
_____	Supervision of Students on Work Placement	_____	Vocational Assessment and/or Counseling
_____	Personal-Social Counseling	_____	Meetings with VRC
_____	Transit	_____	Other (Please list_____
_____	Reporting - Record Keeping		_____)

Part II.

The following items require you to respond regarding systems. A concept heading is provided for each set of items. You should think about this concept as you answer each item. Work quickly, and answer according to what the concept means to you.

Here is how you use the scale:

If you feel the concept is quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale, you should place your mark as follows:

	This				Not this		
Hot	X	:	:	:	X	:	Cold

Place your mark in the middle of spaces, not on the boundaries. The direction toward which you mark depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seem most characteristic of the system you are judging.
Work quickly. There are no right or wrong answers.

A. Think about the State Vocational Rehabilitation Service System as you answer.

friendly	:	:	:	:	:	:	unfriendly
willing	:	:	:	:	:	:	unwilling
progressive	:	:	:	:	:	:	regressive
harmonious	:	:	:	:	:	:	dissonant
successful	:	:	:	:	:	:	unsuccessful
competitive	:	:	:	:	:	:	cooperative
tough	:	:	:	:	:	:	fragile
fast	:	:	:	:	:	:	slow
strong	:	:	:	:	:	:	weak
constrained	:	:	:	:	:	:	free
eager	:	:	:	:	:	:	indifferent
prohibitive	:	:	:	:	:	:	permissive
severe	:	:	:	:	:	:	lenient
energetic	:	:	:	:	:	:	inert
active	:	:	:	:	:	:	passive
complex	:	:	:	:	:	:	simple
difficult	:	:	:	:	:	:	easy
unrestricted	:	:	:	:	:	:	restricted
courteous	:	:	:	:	:	:	discourteous
stable	:	:	:	:	:	:	changeable
consistent	:	:	:	:	:	:	inconsistent
limited	:	:	:	:	:	:	unlimited
good	:	:	:	:	:	:	bad
timely	:	:	:	:	:	:	untimely
selfless	:	:	:	:	:	:	egotistic

B. Think about the State Special Education System as you answer.

friendly	:	:	:	:	:	:	unfriendly
willing	:	:	:	:	:	:	unwilling
progressive	:	:	:	:	:	:	regressive
harmonious	:	:	:	:	:	:	dissonant
successful	:	:	:	:	:	:	unsuccessful
competitive	:	:	:	:	:	:	cooperative
tough	:	:	:	:	:	:	fragile
fast	:	:	:	:	:	:	slow
strong	:	:	:	:	:	:	weak
constrained	:	:	:	:	:	:	free
eager	:	:	:	:	:	:	indifferent
prohibitive	:	:	:	:	:	:	permissive
severe	:	:	:	:	:	:	lenient
energetic	:	:	:	:	:	:	inert
active	:	:	:	:	:	:	passive
complex	:	:	:	:	:	:	simple
difficult	:	:	:	:	:	:	easy
unrestricted	:	:	:	:	:	:	restricted
courteous	:	:	:	:	:	:	discourteous
stable	:	:	:	:	:	:	changeable
consistent	:	:	:	:	:	:	inconsistent
limited	:	:	:	:	:	:	unlimited
good	:	:	:	:	:	:	bad
timely	:	:	:	:	:	:	untimely
selfless	:	:	:	:	:	:	egotistic

C. Work Values

Below are listed a series of values typical of workers. Use the following rating scale to rate each value according to how important it is to **you** in your work; and, how important it is to the **system** you work for.

not very important = 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **= very important**

Provide one number for each value.

	Important to you	Important to the System
1. **A sense of Accomplishment** (Lasting contribution)	( )	( )
2. **Associates** (Forming friendships with fellow workers)	( )	( )
3. **Broadmindedness** (Open minded attitude)	( )	( )
4. **Capable** (Competent, effective)	( )	( )
5. **Creativity** (Trying out new ideas)	( )	( )
6. **Intellectual Stimulation** (Solving new problems, continuing education)	( )	( )
7. **Efficiency** (Productivity)	( )	( )
8. **Equality** (Equal opportunity for all)	( )	( )
9. **Helpful** (Working for the welfare of others)	( )	( )
10. **Independence** (Self-reliance, self-sufficient)	( )	( )
11. **Economic Returns** (Raises)	( )	( )
12. **Responsible** (Dependable, reliable)	( )	( )
13. **Social Recognition** (Respect, admiration)	( )	( )
14. **Variety** (Not doing the same thing all the time)	( )	( )

Rank the top five values that are important to you.

#1_____ #4_____

#2_____ #5_____

#3_____

Rank the top five values that are important to the system.

#1_____ #4_____

#2_____ #5_____

#3_____

Part III. Informational Knowledge

A. Answer the following questions according to your level of agreement

Use the following scale:

1 = Yes, I'm sure 2 = Yes, I think so 3 = Don't know 4 = No, I don't think so 5 = No, I'm sure

- A VR counselor may be involved in special education consultation and planning as early as the freshman year . . . . . ( )
- VR may find student eligible based on a diagnosis of "behavior disorder" if other eligibility criteria are met . . . . . ( )
- A behavior assessment is a part of eligibility determination for LD students . . . . . ( )

Code_____

1 = Yes, I'm sure 2 = Yes, I think so 3 = Don't know 4 = No, I don't think so 5 = No, I'm sure

- A student with an IQ of 86 who has no other disabilities may be eligible for VR services if other eligibility criteria are met . . . . . ( )
- VR can provide financing for training that school district could supply . . . . . ( )
- A student that the school system classifies as LD is automatically eligible for VR services . . . . . ( )
- School districts are required to evaluate students every 2 years . . . . . ( )
- The VAC is responsible for job development for co-op students . . . . . ( )
- Job follow-up is the responsibility of the VAC in co-op programs . . . . . ( )
- It is the responsibility of the VAC to locate job coaches for students engaged in supported employment . . . . . ( )
- Job placement is the responsibility of the VRC in co-op programs . . . . . ( )
- The school/VR cooperative agreement lifts restrictions of confidentiality regarding communication about the student . . . . . ( )
- Vocational readiness training is a strongly emphasized part of a school's training curriculum . . . . . ( )
- The DVR will provide supported employment services for up to 11 months . . . . . ( )
- The individualized education program (IEP) is a required part of the VR case file . . . . . ( )
- The Individualized Written Rehabilitation Plan (IWRP) is always written to correspond to the IEP . . . . . ( )
- At what age may students with disabilities apply for VR services? (Answer in years) . . . . . ( )

B. In general, rate the level of the following attributes regarding relationships **between** special education and vocational rehabilitation personnel. Circle one.

Cooperation	Low =	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 = High
Communication		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Respect		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Understanding		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

What, if any, barriers do you feel impact the cooperative efforts of these two systems?

Thank you for your time. Please provide any further comments regarding the purpose of this survey on the back of this page.

MU, 1990

Appendix C

The Missouri Cooperative Agreement

Form 90-940-401
9/87

AGREEMENT OF COOPERATION BETWEEN
THE DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION
MISSOURI STATE DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY EDUCATION
AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITHIN THE STATE

PURPOSE OF THE AGREEMENT

It has been demonstrated that an effective way to meet the needs of special education students is to emphasize vocational experiences in the secondary school setting. In order to involve the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation of the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education in this process, certain procedures must be closely followed.

The purpose of this agreement is to implement procedures that will permit the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation to encumber funds for services that are not readily available to the student by the local school district.

AGREEMENT OF COOPERATION

The Division of Vocational Rehabilitation of the State Department of Elementary and Secondary Education agrees:

A. To assign a rehabilitation counselor to work with the local school district and the assigned special education teacher in the development and implementation of a vocationally orientated program.

B. To determine the eligibility for rehabilitation services of all handicapped students referred to the agency.

C. To provide necessary services to eligible handicapped students in accordance with the State Plan for Vocational Rehabilitation providing that these services shall not conflict with the service responsibilities assigned to the public school district by Public Law 94-142, the "Education For All Handicapped Children" Act of 1975. Services will be provided only in instances where funding through P.L. 94-142 sources are not readily available.

D. To approve the nature and scope of services to be provided by Vocational Rehabilitation, in order to assure that these services supplement existing services available within the school curriculum.

E. To provide administrative, technical and consultative services as may be needed through state and district Vocational Rehabilitation staff.

F. The assigned Vocational Rehabilitation counselor will be available to serve as a participant in the development of the Individualized Educational Plan (IEP) correlate the Individualized Written Rehabilitation Program (IWRP) with the handicapped student's IEP to assure common objectives and goals and to assure total planning for the student.

G. To provide a copy of the IWRP to the public school district.

H. To perform other duties and functions necessary to carry out the program.

The participating Public School District agrees:

A. To establish a special education cooperative class on a secondary level.

B. To designate a certificated special education teacher to serve as a vocational adjustment coordinator to work with the Vocational Rehabilitation counselor assigned to the local school district.

C. To provide a minimum of one period per school day for release time to the vocational adjustment coordinator for each eight (8) to fifteen (15) handicapped students in the work experience program for adequate supervision.

D. To provide access to and copies of school records and evaluations required by Vocational Rehabilitation before services may be authorized by the Division.

E. The Vocational Adjustment Coordinator (VAC) will be available to serve as a participant in the development of the IWRP and will correlate the IEP with the IWRP in order to assure common objectives and goals and to assure total planning for the handicapped student.

F. To provide an Assurance of Compliance that there is a multidisciplinary assessment on file, an IEP has been developed, the proper programs have been applied and reasonably modified, and the parents have been advised of due process and made aware of the more restrictive environment of Vocational Rehabilitation.

G. To indicate on the student's IEP that the school lacks the resources to provide the needed services or is unable to provide the service in a timely manner.

H. To provide a copy of the IEP to the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.

I. To establish policies and procedures necessary for the district to comply with the requirements specified in the Missouri State Plan for Part B of the EHA as those requirements relate to the operation of cooperative school work programs in local education agencies. The district shall further incorporate the applicable policies in their compliance plan for P.L. 94-142.

J. To perform other duties and functions as assigned and necessary to carry out the program.

This agreement will be reviewed annually to determine if it should be continued and may be terminated by mutual agreement or by either party hereto on thirty (30) days written notice.

This agreement shall become effective upon its signing by the duly authorized representative of the parties hereto.

_____ _____

Superintendent, Date

_____ School District

_____ _____

Don L. Gann, Assistant Commissioner Date
Division of Vocational Rehabilitation